# QUAKERISM NO PAGANISM:

OR, A

FRIENDLY REPLY

To W. R. his

UNFRIENDLY DISCOURSE

INTITULED

*Quakerism, or Paganism.*

SHAWING

The Insufficiency of what he hath Written to Unchristian the Quakers, and to render them as Heathens and Pagans to the People.

---

By W. L. a Lover of Peace more than of Parties.

---

*Let not them that are mine Enemies wrongfully Rejoice over me.*

*For they speak not Peace, but they devise deceitful matters against them that are quiet in the Land.* Psal. 35. [illegible]

---

*Nihil quidquam mea prout aut provide dici potest, quod non vellicare malignitas possit.* Just. Lip. de una Relig.

---

London, Printed in the Year, 1674.

MVSEVM
BRITAN
NICVM

*To all called Non-Conformists, who are Lovers of Holyness, and Followers of Peace with all Men.*

BELOVED BRETHREN,

MAny have been my Perils at Sea, and Perils at Land; and now, for your sakes, I am brought to taste of those Perils, which the unkindness of some, and malice of other *False Brethren* have cast upon me. The occasion they have taken is this;

No sooner was a breathing space of Liberty granted us, to Worship God according to our Consciences; but presently the Spirit of Strife and Debate entred into the Sons of *Dissenters*, and filled Pulpits and Presses with Disputations and Controversies against an Inoffensive People about matters, in no moderate mans Judgment, Fundamentally necessary to Salvation; and yet furiously presst upon that account by those, who otherwise could have no pretence for their impertinent Zeal.

When I saw this Imprudence could not contain it self within the bonds of our respective Meeting-places, nor quietly be lodged in Booksellers shops, for those only to read, and buy that took delight in matters of Controversie; but that Books of that kind, full of bitter and disgracing Language, were sent to be cryed about the Streets, and in the Gates of our Exchange, to publish our Simplicity, and make us a Disgrace, and a By-word to the Merchants of all the Nations about us, who certainly could not but withal Pity us, (though some do not pity themselves) while we stabbed, and wounded with such envious Tongues and Pens; I say, the sight and report of these things, so pressed my Spirit, that I could not forbear to write a few lines, only that I might signifie what a desire I had, and many more, to quench those flames of Zeal, which under pretences of Truth, are burning up all Christian Love and Charity among us.

I have good reason to say many, for I cannot meet with one sober Christian of any Church whatsoever, that is not grieved at heart for these unprofitable Assaults.

The Title I gave that small Treatise, is, the *Twelve Pagan Principles*. This I foresaw would make a fearful sound: But I sent it up with that name, that you in the City might know what Language some taught us in the Country by their mincing Negatives: for we know but one word in opposition to Christianity, and that is *Heathenism* or *Paganism*, though I confess this word *Pagan*, is not so common as *Heathen*, yet we know both signifie one thing. So that when you tell us the *Quaker* is no *Christian*, what says every Plough man? then he must be a Heathen.

Again, Sometimes an odious and shameful Name brings a thing into contempt undeservedly, much more when it is deservedly and properly given. My Design was to make Disparations of this kind contemptible, and therefore I did hope the Name might make them nauseous to the people. And I have the Apostle for an Example, who when he went about to wean the Ceremonious *Galatians* from Elements, calls them weak and beggarly.

Soon after I had published my Obser-

vations upon these Twelve Opinions, collected by *T. H.* out of his *Dialogues*, I was in hope to hear of more able and powerful Instruments (as little Pearcers make way for great ones) appearing in so seasonable and honourable a work as Pacification; whose Wisdome and Prudence might allay the noise of that Passion which so much hinders the sound of Truth, and produce such charitable thoughts, and friendly Correspondency, that the Government under which we live, might be encouraged to continue our Liberty; a peaceable Neighbour being a good sign of a peaceable Subject.

But behold, (O Friends!) contrary to my expectation, another *Goliah* starting forth, and in *Hebrew*, *Greek*, and *Latin* bidding, in effect, Defiance to Peace, derideing and abuseing my moderate considerations, tendered only to incline the minds of both Parties to forbear farther Contentions about these Opinions.

And although he tells us in the first line of his Book, *That he designs not to traduce the Person of any man, or wrong him in his Sentiments of Religion*, yet he has closed

closed it up with an Epistle which does both; and that in such a Malicious and Contradictious manner, as in probability may bring a blast upon his whole Design, as I shall shew in the Conclusion. It's true, I cannot lay the Epistle it self at W. R. his door, but this is plain, that if he had no design nor desire to traduce, he might have sent me a Copy of that Letter before he published it, and if I could not have satisfied him, he had been blameless; but now I may say, *qui non vetat peccare cum possit, jubet.*

But moreover, though he traduces not my Person; yet you may perceive a Spirit very unlike to a Lover of Christianity, creeping along the Book, slighting, jeering, endeavouring to sow Discord, and create Trouble, grossedly charging me with *Shifts and Equivocations*; and what this may be called, I know not, nor do I much care, being confident that he who hath enabled me by his Grace, to pass through good Report, will also assist me to bear the contrary; which (all things considered) is a burden more easie, and less dangerous.

As touching the Book it self, I shall not meddle with those matters in it which have already been sufficiently controverted, but only such of those particulars which relate to my Constructions put upon those Twelve Opinions, which were the occasion of my first Writing.

*W. K.* is much mistaken if he think to draw me to dance after his Disputing Pipe, especially at such a time, and in such a Cause as this is, which one grain of Christian Charity would easily Reconcile.

In a word, If the Controversie had not been strued up so high, as to exclude the Quakers from the number of Christians, and to render them as *Heathens*, *Pagans*, and *Infidels* to their Neighbours, Friends, and Relations, *W. K.* perhaps had never heard of such a Title as Pagan Principles, but *hinc illæ Lachrimæ!*

Having thus given you the true occasion of that Book, and the Reasons of its Title, I shall first take some notice of *W. K.* his Preface, and then to the particular Charges as before mentioned.

1. He begins with a Complemental

Per-

Perſuaſion to Mr. *Penn* to own the Man Chriſt Jeſus. This is very ſtrange, that when he and others, he eſpecially, hath ſo often and in as plain words as can be deſired, to the ſatisfaction of ſo many, that *W. R.* ſhould ſay he ſeems yet to deny him. Could I perſwade him, he ſhould not write a Line more upon this Subject; for I know the Spirit of Curioſity and Jealouſie will never be ſatisfied, but call whatever he ſays, *Words of perſuaſive Pretences, Clouds of Impertinences*, &c. Nay, in all probability, if he ſhould write much more about it, he would ſoon have others as loudly calling upon him to own the Divinity, as now *W. R.* and many more do to own the Humanity; for ſo it happened after his writing the *Sandy Foundation*, &c.

1. The next thing remarkable, are the Reaſons why he preſents his Book to Mr. *Penn*. In the firſt, he inſinuates ſuch an intimacy betwixt us, *as if he had a hand in Compoſing the Pagan Principles*, which in a word is falſe. In his Second and Third Reaſons, ſee how plainly he contradicts himſelf, in ſaying, *I have eſpouſed W. P. his Quarrel, and yet have*

*layed nothing to Mr. Hicks his Charge*; when as Mr. *Penns* Charge is the only Quarrel (as *W. R.* calls it) and I never heard of any other betwixt them. Neither have I espoused this any farther, than in a moderating way betwixt them in Love to both, which I believe is a Duty more incumbent upon many others, for neglect whereof, I desire they may not be accountable at the Great Day. *W. R.* might plainly perceive that my design was not to Charge, for in p. 4. I said, *My Intent is only to shew how small a quantity of Christian Charitable Construction might make these Charges passable among us all.* Again, what a strange Inference doth *W. R.* draw from my calling *T. H.* my Friend, *that therefore* W. P. *ought not to call him Forger.* May not one of my Friends wrong another of them, and no necessity lie upon me to fall out with either, or to interpose, unless for the Reason aforenamed? *T. Hicks* his Conversation has been reputed honest for many years, and being willing to hope, that in general it is so still, I call'd him *Friend*, and desire not to carry it otherwise towards him, though I am *no Friend*,

*to his Dialogues.* And if in them, he has wronged *W. P.* or others, either by adding to, or substracting any thing from their writings, or by putting down any Answers for theirs, which are not theirs (which is to be feared) he would do very well to follow that Counsel *W. R.* gives *W. P. viz.* retract, and count it no dishonour to him.

It's a difficult thing to turn Religious Controversies into a *Dialogue*, without consent of both Parties; for if he change but a letter, he is liable to a lash, unless he has been so careful to preserve the sence of his Antagonist, that he cannot object against it; and then no man can be angry. You may see by what I have done, that the *Quakers* are not so curious of their words, but that they will give us leave to put in such as may help us to a right understanding of their Principles, when their own expressions seem dark unto us. "

The remainder of what *W. R.* hath writ, worth noting, before he comes to the Charges, contains a bad Comparison, and a far-fetcht Conclusion.

First, He compares me *to him that in-*

*sen*

*tending to kill his Enemy with a stab, let out the Imposthume.* But let him remember the Proverb, *mala mens, malus animus.* The Imposthume indeed is somewhat (*prob dolor*) to the purpose: For it's greatly to be feared that there are too many inward Swellings of Pride, Covetousness, Evil Surmizings, and Malice among many sorts of Professors this day; And O how happy would those *Pens* be, that (by the blessing of the Almighty Physitian) should be made Spiritual Love Lances to let them out. But as for the other Part of the Similitude which represents me as an Enemy to the *Baptists*, he does thereby eminently signifie his Ignorance, and adds that, which his last seven years Certificate will not countenance.

Secondly, *W. R.* draws such a Conclusion from my Title Page, as I think *Zoilus* himself would not have done. Because I say, "these are Twelve "Opinions for which *T. H.* has publish-"ed the Quakers to be no Christians, *that therefore I confess they hold them.* If this be not a Quibble, I never heard one. And the root of it is this Particle (*for*)

But

But is it not a common and plain form of Speech among us to say, Such a man was posted *for* a Coward, or accused *for* a Jesuite, and does it follow then that he was so? I doubt *W. R.* minds the *Idioms* of *Greek* and *Hebrew* so much, that he forgets the Propriety of his Mother Tongue. But what need all this, when in *p.* 4. I say, to prevent mistakes, "Think not I plead for them, as if I in-"self, or they owned them; for both in "their Books, and Conferences, they "deny at least ten of them, as they are "layed down and construed by *T. H.* Alas, poor *Qunkys!* Now I pity you more than ever; *no marvel if you complain so sadly of wrong Constructions, Forgeries, and Lyes, when such plain words as these will not free me from a Confession I never thought of!* Poor Flock of Slaughter! Zac. 11. 4. *I see your own Country men must not speak a word for you, unless they resolve to be your Companions in Tribulation. All words that can be devised against you shall, and those that cannot shall be rejected as Whimsies and Impertinencies.* However, I shall proceed to make some brief Reply. But here I am in a streight,

for

for I see my brevity is liable to be fille
up with Words to make it speak Absu
dities, or contrary Senses: And if I u
many words, then I shall be counted
man of words, wanting Wisdome o
good Argument. Well, do as the Lo
directs, O my Soul, and leave the issu
to himself.

1. The first Charge against the Qua
kers is, *That the light in every Man is God*
Now because this Charge as it lies, seem
to fix many foolish and improbable Ab
surdities upon them, as that when the
pray, *they only pray to a God within them*
*and that they make as many Gods, as there*
*are men in the world*, therefore, said I, t
moderate the Charge, prevent mistakes
and render it more intelligable to every
man, put in but (of) and all is well. An
this *W. P.* himself does in p. 8 of *R. against*
*F.* Where we have him thus answering
*T. H.* about this very Charge, and saying
"That the Light within present with us
"every where, is to us the great proo
"of Gods omnipresence, and therefore
of God. And in page 7, he blames *T.*
*H.* for insinuating from *G. W.* his words
that every Illumination is whole God
And

And as much he said to *John Faldo* page 10th of *Quakerism a new nick name*. "Far "be it from us to assert, every such il- "lumination to be the only Lord and "Saviour and very God; and more to the same purpose in that page. And indeed in these places *W. R.* should have looked for *W. P.* his sence and not have run 48 pages farther & bring something spoken of Christ as a contradiction to what he said before, to which it had no relation.

But farther methinks I see *W. R.* sporting and triumphing over this Addition of mine, by letting fly so many Scripture instances, to shew what strange sences the taking out or putting in of a word or letter will produce. He tells us of a Printer that left out, Not, in the 7th Commandment and then it was *Thou shalt commit adultery*. And another fancy (perhaps) of his own, which had been better concealed, for it looks too much like prophane Drollery, from 1 *Cor.* 15, 51, where saith he take away (r) from Changed, and then it is, *We must all be hanged!* But are these instances to our purpose? Is the Case all one

be-

between the Scriptures and those mens writings who are alive to approve or disown what additions you make again: the words & letters that *W. R.* substracts from Scripture are such as make the Sence remaining, run directly contrary to all Scripture and Reason, whereas my Addition made the Charge agree with both. But,

Thirdly, Though I know we cannot add any word into the Scripture, yet consider whether most Christians do not either in their Doctrinal or Practical Comments upon it, make Additions. When any man Baptizeth by vertue of the Commission *Mat.* 28. 19. doth he not add the word (*water*) to it? When we oppose the *Roman Purgatory* pressed upon us from 1 *Cor.* 3. 14. do not we add (*before Death*) or some words to that purpose? When one saith, Christ died for all men, and proves it from 1 *Tim.* 2. 6. will not another of a contrary mind say the word (*Elect*) is to be understood or added to make it agree with other Scriptures? Now this is my Case, & they who make these Additions, justifie me: for as these words make these texts

in

In their understanding agree with others more plain and less liable to exception, so my Addition made this Charge more agreeable to other plainer Writings of the *Quakers*. Seeing then there are different senses put upon these Texts and others I could name; *W. R.* did not considerately compare the *Quakers Writings* to *Heathen Oracles*, because in some places they may seem to admit of divers Constructions: for he cannot but see what will follow, if an Argument should be drawn from the Premises upon him.

The Second Charge against the Quakers is, *That the Soul is a part of God, and of Gods Being, without Beginning, and Infinite.*

Here said I, what hurt is there in all this? that is, in this Notion about the Soul, or in twenty more of the like nature? But when I proceed to say I never heard the *Heathen* were of this Opinion, then *W. R.* makes advantage of my brevity, and presently falls to proving that the *Heathen* had divine Apprehensions of the Soul, which I deny not: but this is not our business; *W. R.* should have kept his eye upon the main design

of this Charge, as I did, which *T. H.* tells us verbatim in p. 16. of the first *Dial.* is to bring an absurdity upon the Quakers; for saith he, *If this be so, then their Opinion must be thus understood, God sets up a Light in himself, which He Himself is to obey, and in so doing he shall be saved*: Now to this being the substance of the Charge (and without this there's no hurt in it) I said the Heathen were not of this Opinion, or drew they any Consequences from their Apprehensions of the Soul, leading them to any inward Idolatry: but rather on the contrary, as the changing the glory of God into Images of Men and Beasts, *Rom.* 1. So that nothing is more opposite to *Quakerism*, than *Heathenism*, vulgarly understood, that being all for *Inward* Spiritual Worship, and this for an *Outward* gross Idolatry.

Moreover, under this Charge, *W. R.* makes a disparity betwixt the Soul of Man, and Spirit of God, which I oppose not, because it hurts not the Question, *viz. Why may we not as well say God hath given us a measure of Himself as a measure of his Spirit*: No saith he, *because the Soul*

is

*is a Creature made by God immortal, and cannot die:* But in ſo ſaying he oppoſeth *Auſtin* and *Jerome*, who ſay, "That if "the Soul be ſeminated with the Fleſh, "or come *ex traduce*, then it ſhall die "with the fleſh. If I ſhould tell him what the Lord ſaith, *Ez.* 18. *The Soul that ſins ſhall die*; I know he would anſwer, that Soul there ſignifies the Body; and why it may not ſo be taken in *Iſa.* 57. I leave to others to judge. For my own part, though I believe the Soul Immortal, yet I never ſaw any great cauſe to *Anathema* thoſe that held it ſlept with the body, ſo long as they firmly believed, it ſhould be raiſed again to partake of Immortality; for the Conteſt betwixt us is but about a little ſpace of time, which in the Grave ſignifies nothing: but indeed betwixt them and the *Roman Catholicks* this Conteſt is of great concernment, for it utterly overturns their profitable Doctrine of Purgatory. Therefore they have no reaſon to ſuffer it. But why we may not bear with one another about that, and this Notion about the Soul in the Charge, ſo long as the Abſurdity aforeſaid is deteſted, I know not. And for all

of this Charge, as I did, which *T. H.* tells us verbatim in p. 16. of the first *Dial.* is to bring an absurdity upon the Quakers; for saith he, *If this be so, then their Opinion must be thus understood, God sets up a Light in himself, which He Himself is to obey, and in so doing he shall be saved*: Now to this being the substance of the Charge (and without this there's no hurt in it) I said the Heathen were not of this Opinion, or drew they any Consequences from their Apprehensions of the Soul, leading them to any inward Idolatry: but rather on the contrary, as the changing the glory of God into Images of Men and Beasts, *Rom.* 1. So that nothing is more opposite to *Quakerism*, than *Heathenism*, vulgarly understood, that being all for *Inward* Spiritual Worship, and this for an *Outward* gross Idolatry.

Moreover, under this Charge, *W. R.* makes a disparity betwixt the Soul of Man, and Spirit of God, which I oppose not, because it hurts not the Question, *viz. Why may we not as well say God hath given us a measure of Himself as a measure of his Spirit*: No saith he, *because the Soul*

is

*is a Creature made by God immortal, and cannot die:* But in ſo ſaying he oppoſeth *Auſtin* and *Jerome*, who ſay, "That if "the Soul be ſeminated with the Fleſh, "or come *ex traduce*, then it ſhall die "with the fleſh. If I ſhould tell him what the Lord ſaith, *Ez.* 18. *The Soul that ſins ſhall die*; I know he would anſwer, that Soul there ſignifies the Body; and why it may not ſo be taken in *Iſa.* 57. I leave to others to judge. For my own part, though I believe the Soul Immortal, yet I never ſaw any great cauſe to *Anathema* thoſe that held it ſlept with the body, ſo long as they firmly believed, it ſhould be raiſed again to partake of Immortality; for the Conteſt betwixt us is but about a little ſpace of time, which in the Grave ſignifies nothing: but indeed betwixt them and the *Roman Catholicks* this Conteſt is of great concernment, for it utterly overturns their profitable Doctrine of Purgatory. Therefore they have no reaſon to ſuffer it. But why we may not bear with one another about that, and this Notion about the Soul in the Charge, ſo long as the Abſurdity aforeſaid is deteſted, I know not. And for all

*W. R.* huffs at my Confidence in saying, "It's strange we should differ about we "know not what; I see no reason he has given to leave off this Admiration: For if he should devote himself to read all that ever has been written about the Soul, and all its Definitions, and all such *Quiddities* about it as *tota in toto*, and *tota in qualibet parte*, I dare affirm he will not be more able to tell us what the Soul of Man is than he was before. Therefore let him not think that I write any thing about the Soul to make him much the wiser, but only in this sense, that we may all be so wise as to leave contending about it. And for this cause I shall take no notice of more Questions of that Subject; for I think he puts them but to try whether I will be so foolish as to Answer them.

I shall conclude this Charge with telling *W. R.* that I writ not those Verses he jerks me for, to jeer my Friends, but that by telling them what others say, they may be weaned from these unprofitable and dishonourable Disputes, whom it chiefly concerns to think on it. But if I were minded to seek after a jeering Spi-

rit in his Writings, I doubt I ſhould find a downright one in that pertinent Queſtion, he ſo often hath put to the *Quakers*, viz. *What ſome of thoſe things were, that our Saviour did upon Earth that are not Written?* Don't you think this a wiſe one, and a charitable one too?

Doubtleſs he might have poſed the Prophet *David* with an eaſier Queſtion than this; For he ſaith, *Pſal.* 35. 15. *That the Abjects gathered themſelves againſt him, and he knew it not*, though 'tis like they were not very far from him. Nothing is more common now a days, than to jeer with a Queſtion. Our Saviour himſelf was ſo ſerved, *Mat* 26. 68. *Propheſie unto us thou Chriſt, who is he that ſmote thee?*

The Third Charge, *That Jeſus Chriſt is not a diſtinct Perſon without us.*

To this I ſaid, as a Motive to Moderation, "That becauſe this Definition of a "Diſtinct Perſon *without* us, is not in "Scripture, why ſhould we impoſe it on "them? eſpecially conſidering what "Reaſon they give for their tenderneſs "in refuſing ſuch Expreſſions, becauſe "they occaſion people to retain mean,

"and dark Apprehensions of God and "Christ, and his place of Residence. *W. P. Count. Christ*, p. 79. If *W. R.* fears no such Consequences, let him use them without Unchristning others that do not. And whereas he saith, *It is shameful for a* Quaker *to refuse those Expressions because not in Scripture, while he owns not the Scripture for a Rule*; I say it's much more shameful for those that own the Scripture for a Rule, to impose such expressions upon others which are not in Scripture, they have reason to keep you to what you call the Rule.

But *W. R. will prove the word Person, yea and a distinct Person too, from* 2 Cor. 2. 10. where the Apostle saith, *for your sakes forgave I it in the Person of Christ*: Here a grain of his Greek might have been useful: For that which the Translators according to their Judgment have rendered *Person* of Christ, whether it may not as well be read in the sight of Christ, ἐν προσώπῳ Χριστοῦ, *in conspectu Christi*, or in Christs stead: I leave to more able men, than *W. R.* or I am to determine.

There is sixteen more pages spent in this

this Charg, which I can account no other, than a vain floriſh, to let *W. P.* ſee what *W. R.* can do, if he be not conſtant to what he has ſpoken: For theſe pages are chiefly ſpent (laying aſide the *quibles about the Aſs*) in proving the Humanity of Chriſt, which I told him the Quakers did not deny, and brought *W. P.* his Confeſſion at the *Barbican* Meeting to prove it, *viz.* that we do faithfully believe the holy *Manhood* to be a Member of the Chriſt of God: and a little after, *We believe the Man Chriſt Jeſus to be glorified in Heaven.* This, though *W. R.* cannot diſlike, yet he will diſtruſt, and therefore ſays, *that when* W. P. *has given us ſome* infallible *Demonſtration, that he did not ſpeak equivocally, then, and not till then do his words deſerve my Cognizance.*

What Unbelief is here! Nay, what a ſtrange Demand is this, for one that is an utter Enemy to Infalibility in the Quakers, to demand an *Infallible* Demonſtration from them? Now that muſt be viſible or elſe he cannot judg of it: And what viſible Demoſtration any Chriſtian can give, which may not be counterfeited by an Hypocrite, I no-

ver yet knew. The truth is, *W. R.* doth ignobly to apply *Aug.* words to Mr. *Penn*, viz. *They speak it with their lips, they believe it not with their hearts.* What is this in plain Engliſh, but to tell the world *W. P.* is a *diſſembling Hypocrite*, and his word, how ſincerely ſoever given, not to be taken; for truly I will not believe that mans word in Civil Affairs, whoſe ſolemn publick word I cannot believe in Spiritual. But that you may know this is not ſuch a new Article of their Faith as to bear date from that *Barbican Meeting*, hear what *Edward Burrowes* ſome years ago ſaid, in his 138, and 281. pages of his works, *We prize the Lord Jeſus Chriſt as* God Man, *and own him* alone *to be the* Foundation *God hath laid.* Now if this be not ground enough for *Chriſtian Charity* towards them (the thing I aim at) God deliver me from ſuch Judges; for I know not what can be farther urged in this particular to induce them to it.

The Fourth Charge is, *That Chriſt Redeemed himſelf.*

This I ſaid was but *T. H.* his Conſequence; and I believe he thinks it natu-

ral

ral from some of the Quakers sayings. But if they disown it, as we see they do, and call it a gross perversion of their words, why must we not believe one as well as the other, and give them leave to take those words of *J. N.* and *G. F.* in a Figurative sence as well as *W. R.* takes liberty to expound *Isa.* 59. 16. and 63. 4. by a Figure? For so *W. P.* saith, p. 63. of *R. against R.* they are to be taken; and there he treats at large of the Redemption of the Seed, and in what sence they hold it, wherein there is nothing sounds like *Heathenism*, or unworthy of Toleration in my understanding; to be sure it cannot be called their Principle, that is but his Inference. But I think we need say no more of their *Consequencing Charge*, for it is so harsh and sour, there's no fear that any sober man will drink it.

The Fifth Charge against the Quakers, is, *That they deny the Scriptures to be the Rule of Faith, and Practice unto Christians.*

The first thing necessary in this Charge is to resolve *W. R.* what I mean by *We*, *Us*, and *Our*, in this Discourse. I Answer, that now we are Charging them with

with denying the Scriptures, I understand all of us that do own the Scriptures for our Rule. And at other turns in my former book, I understand all such ridged Opposers of the *Quakers* as for these Twelve Opinions render them as *Pagans* and *Heathens*; and yet I would hope they do it from a zeal only to promote (as they think) the Glory of God, and the Authority of the Scriptures: And therefore my hearts desire and prayer for them is, that they may see that this Zeal of theirs, *is not according to knowledge*; for the Nature of it is such as will directly lead them to joyn with those, who when Opportunities are offered, *will fall to killing Christians upon a Principle of doing Christ good service*, Joh. 16. 2. And I put my self among them, (though thanks be to God not inclinable to that Zeal) because the Purport of the Book represents me as standing among them, pleading as well as I could for a little Moderation towards the *poor Quakers*, and not the *Quakers Cause*, any farther than as it might admit of favourable Constructions for that End. Neither can you say I am any otherwise

guilty

guilty of Uncharitableneſs, when I ſay, *let us be Charitable*, than the Apoſtle was of Curſing, when he ſaid, *therewith curſe we men, Jam.* 3. 9. But you'l ſay, *the Apoſtle and they were Brethren, but I am not in fellowſhip with theſe that now oppoſe the Quakers.* For your ſatisfaction in this Particular, I refer you to my Narrative in Anſwer to the *Reading Letter* in the concluſion hereof; and proceed to tell you that I perceive you cannot eſcape my *Covering* as you call it; as narrow as it is, I ſee it wraps you ſo faſt that it makes you angry, and call their book of the *Barbican* Meeting, *Scurrilous*, and the cloſe of the Title page, an *Abominable Untruth*, and that *they ſeem to have no regard to Truth or Honeſty.* If theſe be not angry words, I know none. But in all theſe five pages concerning this Charge, where is a particular of any one Scripture, not relating to ſome external part of Worſhip, which they deny. Why ſhould you ſay they deny the *Bible* which contains all the Books? This is but quibbling, by which you know I may eaſily prove that you deny it all by denying *Circumciſion*, a part therein contained.

tained. But in short, Sir, Be not angry, for I must tell you, that until all we, that own the Scriptures for our Rule, come to an Unity in Faith and Practice, according to it, and its well known we are now far from it, methinks it seems a pitiful contradiction for us to press it upon others as an easie, plain, intelligible and unalterable general Rule.

Do you think our Divisions, both in Doctrine and Discipline about it, do not wonderfully weaken our Commendations of it, as the Evangelical appointed Rule? yea, in so much, that Church, Discipline, Doctrines will hardly keep people awake while they are Preaching up even from Scripture Authority.

They may well say unto us, *Physitians heal your selves; agree among your selves, ye wise and Learned, what is the mind and meaning of the Scriptures, about which now ye dispute, and then we will more willingly conform to what you call Scripture Ordinances and Appointments.*

Lastly, Sir, you conclude this Charge with a palpable abuse of my words: "Seeing then (said I) the great De-"sign of all the Scripture, is to bring us

"to

"to an holy life, let's bear with Opini-
"ons, which we plainly see do not sub-
"vert it, especially considering, that we
"read of no punishment denounced a-
"gainst men for their Opinions. Now
can any fairly and honestly conclude
from hence, *that I allow of wicked, Atheistical, and Antichristian Principles?* But
I see you are resolved to bring me under
some manner of Scandal if you can:
therefore in your 42*d* page, you say I for-
get, *That Corrupt Principles lead to Corrupt Practices.* No, I do not forget it;
nor do I plead for, or go about to extenu-
ate any sinful or corrupt Principle, but
to oppose that of Pride and Bitterness a-
gainst others; Demonstration is the best
proof in this Case. Survey the Quakers,
and put their Lives and Conversations
into one *Balance* of the *Sanctuary*, and
the lives of any other sort of Christians
into the other, and if they be found the
lighter, I'le never speak a word more
for them as a People. How long must we
wait to know a corrupt Principle? They
have been among us about six or seven
and twenty years, and yet we see no
corrupt Practices growing from their
Prin-

Principles, Certainly, were such evil Fruit, as you imagine, natural to the Tree; we should have seen it before now: for you say, *when a mans Conscience is debaucht, we shall quickly see him a man of a debaucht Conversation.*

The Sixth Charge is, *That the speaking of the Spirit in any, is of greater Authority than the Scriptures.*

To this I said, (and I see no cause to alter my saying) "that there is no Reason "for this Charge to be drawn from *G. "Whiteheads* words: For these words "(*and greater*) being added to the clo- "sing of the Sentence doth plainly signi- "fie to me that it must relate to the In- "fluence: For what doth Authority signifie without Influence? Of what worth is the Authority of a Magistrate, where his Commands are not regarded? Now it must be the Spirit opening of our hearts, as it did the heart of *Lydia*, to hearken to the Scriptures, and suffer them to have any impression upon us, or Authority over us; wherefore *W. R.* saith well, *That whatever good effect the Preachers Doctrine hath upon the Soul, it is wrought by those words, not as they are*

*the*

*the words of men, but as indeed the words of God, which effectually work in them that believe.* So that they must first believe them before there will be any effectual work wrought by them; and this they cannot do without the inward operation, and Conviction of the Holy Spirit; Therefore I see no evil in ascribing the greater to the Spirit, so long as they give a great Authority to the Scriptures; both which, *G. W.* doth in his Answer cited by *T. H. viz.* "That which was "spoken from the Spirit of Truth in any, "is of as great Authority as the Scrip-"tures and Chapters are, and greater. I must put in Chapters now, for Civilities sake, for *W. R.* catches at my leaving them out before; but truly I know no difference or force depending on Chapters more than Scriptures; they were Scriptures before they were in Chapters. But the great Reason of this Charge is yet behind, and the Apeal directing me to *Dial.* 1. *p.* 28. there I find it, *viz.* "That because the Script. if diligently "consulted with, would deter persons "from believing the Quakers feigned "Revelations, therefore 'tis, they so much

"much endeavour to beget in the minds "of men an ill Opinion of them.

This is a hard Cenſure, and how he will get off I know not, unleſs by way of ſuppoſed Conſequences, for I dare ſay they never told any man, *that their endeavours were to beget in the minds of men all ill opinion of the Scriptures, or that they feared the Scriptures would deter perſons from believing them.* But it being none of my Purpoſe to give a particular account of their Faith in this, or other Points, I refer thoſe that are minded to know their Judgment about the Script. to the *4th*, *5th*, *6th*, *7th*, *8th*, & *9th*, Chapters of *Quakeriſm a new nick name for old Chriſtianity*, and the Defenſe of it. And whereas he ſaith, *a man may ſee how dark my Underſtanding is, that I ſhould acknowledg G. W.'s words, and yet ſee no Reaſon for the Charge.* Is not the Reaſon of the Charge what I laſt mentioned, as a hard Cenſure? And indeed he that ſees a Reaſon for that Conſequence in *G. W.* his words, I confeſs ſees more than I do.

The Seventh Charge is, *That is no Command from God to me, which God hath given by way of Command to another: neither*

then did any of the Saints act by the Command which was to another: Every one obeyed their own Command.

This in Substance is but the two former Charges dress up in other words: For by Commands I suppose *T. H.* means Scripture Commands, and by Saints, such as are recorded in Scripture: And then 'tis no more than what *Ben. Furly* said before, that there is nothing in the Scripture which he is obliged to obey *because there Recorded*. And so say I, not only because Recorded in that Book, do I obey any Command, but because the Spirit of God convinceth me that it is my Duty. For if its very being in that book be the ground of Obedience, what would become of him, who should happen to have one of that false Impression, whose Compositor *W. R.* saith was a *Papist*, and left out NOT in the 6th Commandment? How should he know it was false Printed, supposing he could have no other to correct it by? Must not the *Spirit* or *Light* within be minded in such Cases? *Yea*, or the Man's undone.

But a little more to this Charge, wherein I said there is no great danger because it's stated so in general, that it may admit

mit of good or bad particular Applications. And for proof I shewed several particular Commands from God to others, which did not concern any man now. And several which concerned every man. Neither did I ever hear a *Quaker* say, That not any one of the Commands in Scripture, concern them, though *W. K.* saith *it's manifest they say so*, p. 47. If *T. H.* had told us what particular Commands they deny'd, the work had been more easie and plain to reconcile. But I observe all the Charges against the Quakers concerning the Scriptures run in a general way. I wish it be not, to stop the mouths of all others from speaking a word in their behalf, I am sure it is not fair. Had they been charged with owning *Childrens Baptism*, perhaps some *Presbyterian* might have put in a word for them. Had they been charged with denying *Tithes*, some *Baptist* might have helped them, before now. If for denying *Laying Hands* upon all, to be fundamentally necessary to Church Fellowship, it's probable *T. H.* himself might have assisted them in this, or in opposing the *Saturday Sabbath*, or in maintaining their Doctrine of *General*

Redemption. But now they being convicted for denying Scripture for their Rule, all we which profess the Scriptures to be our Rule, though we are divided into SIX several Churches, and all differ so much in Doctrine and Discipline, that we do not own one another as true constituted Churches, yet we are all stirr'd up by this general Charge of denying Scripture and Gods Commands, to fall upon them. And if the Quakers were all suppress or banisht, whose turn of all the Six would be next I know not; but of this I am confident, That the same spirit which thus persues them, will not let others be quiet when they are gone. Strange that we cannot make better use of our time!

But W. K. puts some more Queries to me also, under this Charge, about the Scriptures, How they can know Swearing to be a sin, or how they can try Spirits without them. To both which, there hath been enough said, at least to beget Moderation, if not Satisfaction, by W. K. in page 96. of Wisdome Justified, &c. And in his Rejoynder undefence of Quakerism a new nick Name, &c. the first part of it being almost all about the Scriptures.

The Eighth Charge, *That Justification by the Righteousness of Christ imputed for us, wholly without us, is a Doctrine of Devils.*

To moderate this Charge, I offered two things to be considered: 1. The *Greek* word which generally in the New Testam. serves for Justification and Righteousness, which are both *Latin* words themselves in *English* habit, and *dikaioun* serving for both, I said, that to be justified was all one in my understanding as to be made Just or Righteous: And this *W. R.* himself confirms out of Mr. *Leyds Critica Sacra*, for he saith, *The word must be understood, to respect that Integrity, Holyness and Innocency of the Souls of Good men, by which they live a holy Life and please God*: which in substance is what I said before, and *W. P.* before both of us, *viz. to be made Just or Righteous*. But saith *W. R.* this cannot be done without their persons be first acquitted of their former Sins by the Justification they receive from Christ through believing; which in plainer *English*, is all one as to say, *This cannot be done before it be done.*

In the next place, *W. R.* falls to distinguishing between a *Legal* Righteousness,

an *Evangelical Righteousness*, and thirdly a *Righteousness which Christ fulfilled for us in his own Person*, wholly *without us*.

The first he saith, *is a perfect Obedience to all God requires at all times, both in thought word and deed.* But where this is called a Legal Righteousness, I know not. I think the Gospel requires as perfect obedience as the Law, and more strict, as in *Mat.* 5.

But Secondly, *W. R.* a Evangelical Righteousness is (only) *a sincere endeavour of the Soul to do all what God requires, although by reason of the poverty of his Nature, he cannot attain it.* Is not this plainly to say, that God requires us now under the Gospel, to do that which he knows we cannot do? This made the Slothful Servant say, *Mat.* 25. *that he was an hard Master.*

But Thirdly, he has distinguished out another Righteousness, which Christ fulfilled for us, which it seems cannot properly be called *Legal*, or *Evangelical*. But what he means by all this, I know not, unless he would bring us to expect to be justified by such a Faith as is without works, and that I hope he will dis-

 own,

own, and if so, all these Distinctions will vanish of themselves, and that I believe they do as fast as they are Preached, being so intricate and hard to be understood, that I know not how any man can tell how to regulate his Faith or Life according to them.

The Second thing I propounded to moderate this Charge, was the words (wholly *without us*) which I said might very well satisfie us, that the *Quakers* doubted not of *Scripture Justification*, but of our conceits of it; of which I see *W. R.* takes no notice. And no doubt he saw cause for it. For *wholly without us*, must either (in this point of Justification) signifie *wholly* without our Faith, or *wholly* without our works, or *wholly* without both: And wherein the Scriptures account any one Justified Person *wholly* without both or either of these, I know not.

But for as much as *W. R.* hath already treated so largely upon the Doctrine of *Justification* in his 8th Chapter of the said Rejoynder, I do hereby desire *William Russel* to go thither to satisfie himself about their Faith in that matter.

matter. As I told him at first, I intend not a Dispute, much less a Quarrel about words; if any thing I have said will but put the least stop to *Careers* of that Nature, I have all the Reward I look for.

The Ninth Charge is, *That Justification is by Works.*

This I said is almost, yea I might have said altogether of the same nature as the former; And it's a great deal of pity to *Heathenize* men for Preaching up good works, especially in an Age when they are so scarce. To which *W. R.* replies, *Rarely well guest. Is T. H. finding fault for Preaching up good works?* But *W. R.* might not I have said the same, to *T. H.* his 4th Charge, *That Christ Redeemed himself*, Rarely well guest, was that ever the Question? did the Quakers ever say so in *terminis*, much less in *T. H.* his sence? but I like none of this *upbraiding, brawling Language.* Certain it is that *T. H.* jares the Quakers for making *them* necessary to Justification, and that I think is as far from *Christianity*, as the contrary is from *Heathenism.*

The Tenth Charge against the Quakers



said

kers is, *That Christ fulfilled the Law only as our Pattern.*

This word *only* being the occasion of this Charge, I did endeavour to moderate, and said, "That to an innocent "understanding, it signifies no more than "*chiefly* as our Pattern, which is far from "signifying, that there is no other end "of Christs fulfilling the Law. And *W. P.* himself mentions other ends in *p.* 79. of *R. against R.* But saith *W. R.* How can I count this an honest Sentence, and yet will not justifie it. And here he leaves out one half of my Sentence, and then cries out, *I am very Inconsistent.* And well may I, or any man else at this Rate. But take all together, and it's thus: *This is an honest Sentence, though I will not justifie it so worded and understood as T. H. doth: For T. H. prints this word* only *in a different Caracter, that it might have such an* Emphasis *put upon it, as was never intended for it.* And again, *T. H.* understands (or else would have others to understand) *by this word only, That Christ fulfilled the Law* (yea *and* died *too*) *for no other end but as our* Pattern *of Obedience and Sufferings.* And if this be not his

his understanding of *W. Penns* Sentence, this Charge is frivolous and of no use or advantage at all against the Quakers. And this sence of it I will not justifie: and I am sure *W. P.* denys it, and oppugnes it. Again, *W. R.* queries, *why I call this Heathen Doctrine, seeing the word Heathen is now so much as mentioned by T. H.* I answer, every Plough-man teaches it me, from the Title page of his *Dialogue*, by a better sort of Inferencing, than helped him to the 4th Charge; *That Christ Redeemed himself*, & far more plain and palpable among the people. And whereas *W. R.* saith, *the honour of that name belongs to me*, I must tell him, that upon a second view, I find he do's Mr. *Falde* wrong: For, although the *Dialogues* made the first noise of *Heathenism* in these parts, yet it seems Mr. *Falde* put out a Book to degrade the *Quakers* from the Title of *Christians*, a little before.

The Eleventh Charge is, *That the Doctrine of Christs Satisfaction is Irreligious, and Irrational.*

As he who is truly desirous to quench a fire, will be most active in pulling away those Brands that increase the

Flame.

Flame. So he that heartily mediates for Peace, labours more to remove those words that stir up wrath, than to make Arguments to strengthen either side. Upon this very Account I said, substract the word *Irreligious*: In hopes, that then the greatest offence taken at this Doctrine might cease. For I know many, and hope there are thousands more, unknown to me, that live religiously, though they believe this Doctrine even in *T. E.* his sence; yea and the Doctrine of *Predestination* too: And am verily perswaded I shall meet them there where all Controversies shall fly away. But for all I have adventured to do this, yet I see *W. R.* will not be satisfied; he must have the whole Charge substracted before the Dispute shall be ended. How true a Representative is this man of the generality of the Contenders, and Disputers of this Day! but oh how lamentable is it! For go into any of their Congregations, and you shall hear them Commending, Preaching up, and Praying for Peace, Moderation, and Christian Charity: But when you come to put them to the test, and know what they

hey will do, or what they will abate to-
vards such an Accommodation? you'l
nd not a word, not a letter, not a hair
f their head, or a *Notion* that signifies
s little, to be parted with for it. So that
ndeed when any of them pray for Unity
r Charity, it is in Substance no more
ut that all may be turned to their Opi-
ions, or else Anathema, Maranatha,
God convert them. But here I cannot
ut take notice of the Quakers peaceable
eſures in not contending with me about
eaving out this word, though *W. P.*
ells me in a jeering way, *it is not to be left*
ut, *for W. P. spake it by immediate Inspi-*
*ation*. Well then, I perceive men speak-
ng by Inspiration are more easily made
lyable to ceaſe from Controverſie, than
hey that speak without it. But let *W.*
*P.* his pretences for Truth be never so
reat, I le not regard them, while he can
oth scoff at one of the greateſt Evangeli-
al Doctrines, abuſe them that confeſs it,
nd by ſuch Fire-kindling Books as this
e hath now publiſhed, not endeavour
o accommodate but extend the diffe-
ence to the hinderance of Peace. So
much concerning *Irreligious*.

Now

Now as to the *Irrationality* of t
Doctrine, I find W. R. himself mak
no Attempt to vindicate it from such
Charge, only sporting himself with
idle quibble or two about it, lets it p
but not without an Untruth to bring
the Rear; For the Searcher of all he
knows, I spake nothing to this or
other point to grantie W. R. or any m
else, which this Enemy to Paganism h
so little Christianity as to suggest.

The Twelfth Principle Charged
the *Quakers* is, *That this Body which*
*shall not rise again.*

Now we are come to the main
the grand Charge. Now says W. R.
61. *Speak out, and be not afraid, now*
*come to the point.* I thought I had spok
plain enough before, or else he doth
if he doth not understand me, I to
*There is no more difference between me a*
*Quaker in this Article, than betwe*
*four pence and a groat.* But if I can
speak louder I shall. Know therefo
W. R. that I believe from the botto
of my heart, *That the Quakers are m*
*falsely abused in this matter, by the ir*
*Insinuations of many malicious men.*

thou

ough the *Citizens* generally have such *arp Needle Heads*, that there's very w of them that mind things of this na- re, but see, or are easily brought to see here the fallacy of a Proposition lies; t scarce one Country man of an hun- ed can discern it. Tell not me what's e Question, but what is the fruits and ects of it: I strike at that. And if you e not willing such absurd Consequences ould be fuckt out of your Questions, ate them so plain as to prevent it. If ou would not have the Quakers called *eathens*, do not say they are no *Chri- ans*. Let *T. H.* come into a Country ditory and Preach that the Quakers ny the Resurrection of this Body, and me afterwards examine them, and if e generality do not go away with this lief (if they give any credit to him) at the Quakers deny the Resurrection, e burn my Books. How often have I ard them in Sermons compared to *Hy- eneus* and *Philetus*, who concerning the uth, have erred *Saying that the Resur- ion is past already*? And what think u can be the Design of this Compari- , but to possess peoples minds, that

they

they deny any Resurrection at
Whereas you cannot but know, that t
Difference betwixt them and us, is on
about the manner of the Resurrectio
a needless, nay, a forbidden Controve
sie, even by him that you think says m
for your Notion. And let any impar
man but read the very Quotations y
have brought out of their Books, a
all that ever *W. P.* has writ about it,
they will say the same. And I shall plai
tell you more, That if I did underst
the Quakers as well in all other poi
as in this, I should not have refrai
their Meetings as I have done and
(not that I think it unlawful to go)
I will not say, *I would be a Quaker*;
is one of the weakest passages in all y
book! As if a man could be a Q
ker, or any other Profession, when
pleased.

Its true indeed he may perh
when he will, take up the forma
of any thing: But to get into
Life, Spirit, and Power of Re
on, is not a work so easie as you
gest. Next I shall speak to that wh
hath something of Argument in it, an

conclu

conclude, I brought a Demonstration sufficient to convince any rational man, that the *Quakers* did own a Resurrection, and a better Being after Death, or else they would never be so mad as to expose themselves to all sorrows and miseries in this life, when they may avoid it. The Apostle himself confirms this Consequence, saying, Let us eat and drink, if to morrow we shall die, and be no more. But *W. R.* rejects this, and brings two Witnesses to be of his side. The first of the *Sadduces*, *which*, saith he, *were men that profest Religion, in opposition to the common Opinion of the Jews, and so consequently were exposed to sufferings.* Mark it, he says they were but *Consequently* exposed to Sufferings, he tells us of none: Nor do I remember any they suffered for their Religion; as true a Consequence as *T. H.*'s used to be. It's true, they shared in the unavoidable Calamities of War; but, that is not to our Business. Other stories mention a Tolleration among them, and that they liv'd peaceably in their several ways. Again, if I may draw Consequences also, it's as probable they were wicked men as

good,

good, notwithstanding their Profession, and their fine name: For nothing is more common, than for the worst men to get the best names. The *Pharisees* name was as full of Holyness, as the *Sadducees* of Justice; and yet were the vilest men in those times. But suppose some particular *Sadducee* should rather suffer death, than deny their *Notions*; this would be no better proof, than if you had brought some high Spirited Gallant, who will out-brave death for a point of Honour. Besides, there is no Confession of theirs now extant, and we know what it is to take one at anothers hand, nor doth *Josephus* make all of them so to bold. Your other Testimony is of the *Essens*. And you bring some of *Josephus* his words, saying, "That notwithstanding they denyed the "Resurrection of the Body, yet they "could not be forced to revile their Law "Maker, but scoff at their Tormentors; "and joyfully yielded up their Souls, as "though they hoped to receive them a-"gain. And so indeed they did, hope for in the same page, saith *Josephus*, "It "was an Opinion among them, that the "Bodies corruptible, but yet the Souls re-

"main

"*main for ever immortal. And that when*
"*they are delivered out of these carnal*
"*bonds, then presently as freed from a long*
"*bondage, they joyfully mount aloft, the*
"*good to felicity, the bad to misery.* Now why would you conceal this? did you think I would trust you? No, you knew this confirmed what I had said, That the *Quakers* exposing themselves to this lifes miseries, was a plain Demonstration they owned a better being hereafter. But you serve *Josephus* as you serve me, either take no more than serves your turn, or stop where it makes an ill sound to the Reader. Mind your dealing in *pag.* 63. where you bring in my Answer thus, "But suppose they should tell us this ve-"ry Body shall not rise, what care I —— Is this a handsome place to stop at, or just, to do so? What will a hasty man be ready to say when he reads this? surely this is a careless man indeed, he cares not whether his Body rise or not: And so may take pett & read no farther; and then what reports must I expect? Sir, this is not Christianity, nor Paganism in the best sence. Such devises as these will do you no service in the end, tho for a time they may bring Scandals upon *Quakers*;

and all that desire their Toleration. You know the whole Sentence is this; "But "suppose they should tell us this very "Body should not rise, what care I, so "long as they tell me *I shall have a better.* And, Sir, when you hear of any Beggar that rails upon another for taking away his *earthen Pitcher*, after he has given it him again turn'd into Gold, then will I repent of this carelesness. Your last and *greatest* Argument to prove your Notion about the manner of the *Resurrection* you would have grounded upon Reason. A thing I confess I love so deerly, that I dayly pray to be delivered from Unreasonable men, *for all men have not Faith*, 2 Thes. 3. 2. whence I conclude, that an unreasonable Faith commonly produces the worst sort of unreasonable works; that is, *Conscience Persecution.* But to your Argument which you say is highly rational; the substance whereof is, *That if the Body be a partaker of the Sin, it should also partake of the Punishment. But the Body is a partaker of the Sin, therefore* —— This I think is your sence, for these are your words. Its absurd to imagine, that one Body should commit the sin, and another Body that never sinned, be pu-

nisht

nisht. To this then I answer, that the Minor is defective: For in this you suppose that the Body is a part of man capable of Action or Passion without, or distinct from the Soul; and if it were so, I confess you are in the right. But it's no such matter. This should have been proved, but I fear it's too Philosophical for you. This Body is but a piece of Animated Clay, and can do nothing, and is good for nothing without the Soul. See Dr. *More* on the point. The evil Spirit cares not for it, if he did, he would not let *Witches* and *Reprobates* be burned. But he knows they shall have such a body at the Resurrection, as is more fit for his purposes in which, the Soul, like *Perillus* in his *Brazen Bull*, may be tormented for ever. So on the other hand, though you say it's not to be allowed, never fear it, I'le venture my eternal life upon it, that none will disalow of the Change of their vile bodies, *when they shall them fashioned like unto the glorious body of our Lord Jesus Christ*. The text you bring makes against you. I grant, the end of the Resurrection is, That we might receive a reward according to the deeds done in the Body, 2 Cor. 5. But it doth not say, we shall receive the reward in

the *same Body* wherein the deeds were done. No, the Apostle tell us in the same *Chapter*, that this House or Tabernacle (meaning his Body) was but a groaning Burthensome thing, and desired to be cloathed with that House which is from Heaven, suppose a poor Tenant in a thackt Cottage should do his Landlord such faithful Service, that at length he should take him out of that Cottage, and Sent him in one of his best Buildings, and therein reward him for his former Service, do you think this will not be allowed? or is this to deny rewards?

But you say you cannot possibly understand that the *Quakers* intend the same Resurrection the Apostle doth in 1 *Cor.* 15: I believe you: For there is a veil over your Understanding, which all your Wisdome cannot remove, *the Lord remove it.* And the *Quakers* may say the like to me; for they believe some five things perhaps which yet I cannot possibly understand: What then, shall I speak evil of that I know not? no, let us wait in the Spirit of Love and Meekness, and *God shall reveal to us whatsoever he sees necessary for us in his own time.* Thus, Beloved Friends, I have given you, and all

that pleaſe to read me, a faithful account why I writ that little Book called *The Twelve Pagan Principles*, and the Reaſons of that Title, together with thoſe Conſiderations; which, in my underſtanding, ought in ſome meaſure to calm the paſſions of thoſe, who at firſt ſight of thoſe Charges (thus ſeperated from all Sayings that might help them) have been haſty to condemn the *Quakers* upon their account. And that I intended nothing but to beget at leaſt a moderate Language, and Behaviour, and to ſtir up others to the ſame work; methinks the great condiſcending and little better than beſeeching way of Arguing I us'd might convince, even *W. R.* himſelf. Had I come forth with a Reſolution to help the *Quakers* to a Victory (though more than I think them ſufficient to their own defenſe, and that their Adverſaries have both wanted and fallen into a confederacy) I would not have talked at that ſubmiſſive truckling rate, of putting in, or taking words out of their Sayings to facilitate their being underſtood? No, I would have betook my ſelf to the more laudable Sanctuary of Rhetorick (eſpecially at a Pinch, as *W. R.* doth *page* 37.)

where Figures, honourable among some men, lie ready to overturn these Charges with little trouble, if better Reason had been wanting: But *W. R.* himself satisfies you that my *Pen was indifferent*, notwithstanding he would have me a Quaker, for he says, *all along my Book, that I have cleared T. H. of Forgery*; then I hope *T. H.* his Party cannot be angry. And on the other side, the *Quakers* making no complaint, signifies they are not offended with what I writ. And if this be not *Indifferency*, there's none in the world. I have heard as if he commended the endeavours of that Quibbling Author of the *Quakers Quibbles*, and that as an indifferent Pen; if so, he shews great blindness that faults me of Partiality. I am of that mind, had *W. R.* been guided by this Loving, Meek, and Peaceable Spirit of Christ when he began to write, he might have expected a Blessing upon his Labours; but let him know assuredly, that while he is a *Promoter* of these unprofitable and dishonourable Disputes, the Lord will not hear his Prayers.

FINIS.

NOtwithstanding the manifest Innocency of my Purpose, and Inoffensiveness of my words, yet hath *W. R.* published an abusive Letter, to which he might very pertinently (if he knew all) have annexed one Line of his Title-page, saying, *Is this thy kindness to thy Friend?* I shall give you an account of the Principal matters in the Letter, relating to my self; but say nothing of the latter part of it, which is all in praise of him to whom it was sent; and smells too much of daubing and design.

*Some Animadversions upon a Letter sent from* D. R. *at* Reading, *to* T. L. *at* London, *concerning* W. L.

IN my Account hereof I shall observe this Method.

1. I shall tell you the Occasion of it.
2. Something of him that Subscribed it.
3. Of the matter contained in it concerning my self.

1. The Occasion was briefly thus, I the said *W. L.* being at the *Barbican* Meeting, *Oct.* 9. and with grief of heart observing, through the unfair carriage of some, how unprofitable it was like to be

to the People (the generality of whom also not shewing that Reverence to the matter treated on, though of a Religious nature, and regard to the desires and Intreaties of those chiefly concerned, that became the weight of the affair) I sent a Letter to *J. I.* bewailing this, and some other unchristian Passages at that time. In this Letter, upon the account of former familiarity, yea and Church Society, never before (but now) disowned, I called him *Brother*; as we usually did when we met. But at this time it happened to be offensive. A little while after I writ the Treatise mentioned in the beginning of this. In one place of that Discourse I blamed *T. H.* for leaving out a Sentence of *W. P.*'s which explained his meaning in the matter of that Charge: This thing *G. W.* taking notice of, bids the *Baptists* consider how "I, their Friend, and Brother had "rebuked *T. H.* Now began ill blood to stir: For some *Baptists* observing the *Quakers* to lay some weight upon this *Brotherhood*, thought it greatly concern'd them to cancel that. Nay *W. R.* is so troubled at it, that in his passion he says, *I am a Quaker*, and concludes, *p.* 53. *that I avoid the name only, that I might be serviceable*

*viceable in propagating their Cause*, which is utterly false. For though *Paul* made it a motive among the simple Idolatrous *Athenians*, & so perhaps it may be now among some poor weak People, to tell them of their own *Poets*; yet I do not believe Examples of this kind are of any force now, meerly as such among those that are impartial, and but of an ordinary Capacity. However, because I had endeavoured to procure any Charity for the *Quakers*, it must be published, *that I am no Baptist*, to let all know, that no real *Baptist* will offer to speak a word for a *Quaker*. But I hope they are mistaken. In order to this, some sent down into the Country where I live, and had a Certificate, *that I had not been in Communion with the Baptists here this seven years past*. And though this was as much as was needful to satisfie the *Quakers*, that they might not call me a *Baptist* any more; yet this did not answer the Design of some. This Certificate was too *fair* & *clean*, I must not go off so. They wanted some dirt, which it seems they were resolved to fling at me, though they daubed their own fingers in doing it. Down therefore they send to *Reading*, where I had lived about 12 years ago,

and

and where I had much more reason to expect they would miss of their purpose. But I was deceived. For there my old Friend *D. R.* (at whose instigation I know not) presently sends up some *Dirty Rags to pin at my back, and some Sugar Plums for* Jeremy, all in this Letter. But truly if his Case had been mine, I would have put them up in my pocket, and never have shew'd them, least an intelligent Reader should suspect I had begg'd them. This in short was the Occasion of this Letter.

2. *Concerning this* D. R. *that Subscribed it, and,* as he saith, *by Consent.* First, it is some comfort that I know the Latitude of that word so well, that I may be bold to say, unless there be a very late increase, *they need not fear the late Act against Conventicles.* But 2*dly*, as to the Man himself, He is one with whom I have had such intimate familiarity, that I may truly say of him, as *David* of his Friend, *Psal.* 55. 13. In many things *He was my Guide, and mine Acquaintance, we took sweet Counsel together, and walked unto the places of the Worship of God in Company.* In short, by his perswasion chiefly, I left a certain for an uncertain way of

live-

livelyhood, to my great loss, that I might be serviceable to him and others upon a Christian Account. There we continued in Church Fellowship together until the Heat of Persecution brake all in pieces, and made us Brethren in Tribulation also. In which Condition it's well known, none of them was a greater Sufferer than my self; for as much as my Concerns were in *Ireland*, and I could not get Liberty to oversee them. And now for this *Daniel*, without any personal provocation, or any other than what he himself counts but a piece of folly, *viz. Writing in behalf of the Quakers*, I say, for him to break all bonds of Christianity and Friendship, publish *Fire-side*, and *Chamber* Discourses, and private Transactions 12 years old, and mix them with false, frivolous, and and scandalous Conceits of his own; What shall I say? shall I write out the 4th verse of the 9th of *Jer.* and put in the word Baptist before Brother? God forbid. *One Swallow makes no Summer.* Although *D. K.* has hereby rendred himself unfit for any mans intimate Friendship, who has made so great a breach of it, yet I hope there are many hundred of the *Baptists* that scorn this Baseness. But for

all

all this I will leſſen his fault as much as I can; for I doubt he was hurried into it by ſome that knew how to work upon his Principle, which is, not *private*, viz, *That unleſs a Believer be Baptized in Water, he has no right to any Promiſes in the Goſpel.* Now no marvil if this Zeal which lays the wait of Salvation upon a little Water, as the *Roman Catholicks* do, be eaſily ſtirr'd up to revile and perſecute ſuch as ſay, *this Baptiſm is not Fundamentally neceſſary to Salvation*, Again, Ignorance doth in part excuſe any fault, and it's well known he never learned *Illud Amicitiæ ſanctum & venerabile Nomen*; nay that he can hardly *read* the Engliſh Rules of Friendſhip; and withal, being an Enemy to that *Light within*, which would teach him thoſe Rules, no wonder if he be eaſily provoked to break them under a pretence for Chriſt; as if Chriſtianity and Humanity were inconſiſtent. I wish therefore I may be a warning to all, how they make Friendſhip with an angry, or ſuch an illiterate man, as makes Formalities the Subſtance of his Religion.

But 3*dly*, *The Matter* concerning me, in the Letter, firſt it relates to ſome things done in Priſon, which gives him

him occaſion to ſay, *That I was blamed for refuſing to give God thanks for any of his Mercies, or to joyn with them that did*; which is a great and manifeſt *untruth*. The ſtory in ſhort is this, I was ſomtimes deſired *to ſay Grace* (as it's called) at Dinner time, which I was not willing to do, but referred it to others, with whom I did joyn; and ſignified it by my conſtant conformity to thoſe outward Ceremonies which are uſual at ſuch times. And from hence is this Reproach raiſed.

The next Charge is, *That I was looked upon by All to be a Quaker*. This word *All* muſt be cut off to the Stumps, and cured with a Figure, or elſe I ſhould prove it a loud —— For I can, if need were, produce hundreds, yea the whole Town in general, that will ſay they never took me for a *Quaker*, (not that I count it any diſgrace to be taken for one, I would have my unkind Friends know, but to ſhew the untruth of this Accuſation.) Neither was there any rational ground for it; for I never was at any *Quakers* Meeting all the time I was there, nor never conformed to any of their Formalities either of Geſture or Language. And then what Reaſon any man had to look

upon

upon me as a *Quaker*, let the Reader judg. As for my being a *Behmenift*, I know not what it is; and therefore can say nothing to it. I never saw any thing of his writing that I could understand, but some *Epiſtles*; And perhaps in private Conference I might commend them: And if It his procured me the Name, they might as well have call'd me *Stillingfleetiſt*, *Greenhilliſt*, *Baxteriſt*, *Cariliſt*, &c. For in theirs, and many other Writings, I have read things worthy of great Commendation. But among all my Names, I wonder he omitted *Jeſuite*, which was more talked of among the Great Men there, than any of the other; and was whiſpered abroad by ſome others ſo long, till at laſt it began to catch fire among ſome weak *Presbyterians*; and then I took a little pains to quench it, though the *Catholicks* themſelves knew it was but an *Ignis fatuus*, or bugbear to fright ſilly people.

In the next place *D. R.* was about to do me ſome kindneſs in this Letter, and tell the Truth of me. But he recollected himſelf (poor man) and thought it not ſeaſonable to do it now, and therefore cuts off that part which might commend

me:

me: For he says, *I am for Universal Communion with All sorts*, he should have said (*of Good men*) and then he had said right: but leaving that out, he do's me wrong. I know the cause of this, he tells you our private Discourses about Mr. *Jesse*, whose practice of this kind I have so much commended, that it's much he did not call me a *Jesuit*. But that Name w s thought too honorable for me.

As for the other traducing Phrases in the Letter, such as, *Strange Humours, uncertain Fictions, wandering Fancies, giddy Brains, tottering Buildings, and rotten Posts*, they are so commonly used among those, and none but those, *that fall* to scolding about Religion, that I think it's greater folly to take notice of them, than it was to Print them. A word in behalf of *G. W.* and I have done.

From what hath been said, and what I could farther say concerning my Relation to the *Baptists*, I do assure *W. R.* that *G. W.* might properly call me their *Brother*, according to the Method of their own Discipline; For since the time I first was joyned to them, about *twenty seven years past*, I never heard the least word of being disowned before now. And as wandering as *D R.* says my fancy is, yet in all this time I never joyned, or commonly Assembled with any other People but them. In all their Dangers and greatest Sufferings I have been Partaker with them, not as it were of Necessity, but Choice; and he and others knew I have been more than once invited to Preach among them. It's true indeed I could not consent to what they call Close Communion in this Country, (though often desired to it) because of some unnecessary Divisions among them, which I did hope in time would be removed; of which in Charity I now forbear to mention.

To

To Conclude, therefore though *G. W.* is not to be blamed in this matter; yet had I known before he publiſhed it, I ſhould have deſired him not to mention my Relation to them at this time; And then probably this trouble about it had been prevented. Only I am doubtful whether I ſhould have ſtopt the publiſhing *D. R.*'s Letter, becauſe it was ſo exactly ſquated to the preſent Deſign of my Defamation; and conſequently (as much as in him lay) of my Deſtruction: But I truſt they ſhall never hear of my rendering Evil for Evil to any man. All the harm I wiſh the Contrivers of it is, *That the Lord would not lay this Sin to their Charge.*

*W. L.*

BY theſe two Letters my Name is well known to the Perſons particularly concerned in this Book, and I have no deſire to ſpread it farther; for that Reaſon which a Learned Man gives us in his Preface to EIPHNIKON, or a Treatiſe of Peace, Printed for *N. Brooks*, 1660. His words are theſe.

"That my Endeavours (ſaith he) might the "rather Proſper, I have concealed my Name, "as well knowing that men are wont to make a "*God* or a *Devil* of a mans Name. If ſuch or ſuch "precious Man ſpeak this or that, *it's received as* "*an Oracle from God*; If the ſame thing be ſpoken "by one decryed, as ſuppoſed Heterodox and Er"roneous, it's eſteemed by the ſame Man, *a* "*Damnable Error.*

*FINIS.*